



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

words of Diomedes have, indeed, come into my mind—“Would that you had not besought him, for the man is haughty and proud.”¹ For, in truth, elated minds, when they are obsequiously cultivated, are only accustomed to become more arrogant. For if the Lord shall be appeased towards us, what other aid do we want? But if the wrath of God shall continue, what succour can we expect from Western pride? men who *neither know the truth, nor wish to learn it*, but, preoccupied with false suspicions, do now the same things as they did before in the case of Marcellus, when they rebuked the men who were telling them the truth, and strengthened the heretics by their acts. I myself wished, contrary to the usual form, to write to their leader (*ἀυτῶν τῷ κορυφάτῳ*, meaning Damasus, then Bishop of Rome);² not, indeed, concerning the affairs of the Church, unless I might have somewhat obscurely insinuated that they neither knew the truth concerning our affairs, nor took the way by which they could learn them; and generally admonished him that men who were vexed with temptations ought not to be insulted, nor was pride to be esteemed dignity, but a sin which has this privilege alone, that it makes men enemies to God.³ It is worthy of remark here how pointedly he calls Damasus “*their*” Coryphaeus, meaning the leader of the West, instead of “Vicar of Christ and head of the universal Church,” as Popes still more proud in later ages have claimed to be by a Divine institution, which they assert to be as ancient as Christianity itself.

We learn from Baronius that Basil elsewhere expressed his strongest resentment against the Western Church; that “he hated the pride of that Church”;⁴ and we find him also in a letter to Count Terentius (Epist. 214, p. 463) imputing to the Western Church culpable ignorance of the state of religion in the East, and especially for having given letters of communion to Paulinus, in opposition to Meletius, the true Bishop of the Church of Antioch, whom he declares he can never desert, nor think the questions trifling or of small moment to piety about which that dissension originally began.

St. Basil’s disappointment at the supineness of the Western Bishops in succouring their suffering brethren in the East was probably the greater, because it appears from another letter of his that the idea that good might be done in that way originated with himself. The following extracts are worthy of serious attention:—“I have of late,” writes Basil, addressing Athanasius, “berought, according to my moderate knowledge of things, of one way by which our Churches might be aided: if the Western Bishops would concur with us; for if they were willing to show, for the sake of our diocese, the care which they have used towards those who have been detected in one heresy or another in the West, perhaps it might yield some benefit to the common welfare, since the Emperor reverences the authority of numbers, and the people everywhere are disposed to follow the majority without hesitation.” But who would be more influential in executing such a design than thee?

Who more venerated than thy hoary head in all the West?
Sen., therefore, some men from thy holy Church, who are powerful in sound doctrine, to the Western Bishops; explain to them the calamities with which we are oppressed, suggest this method of relief; thou mayst become a Samuel to the Churches, &c., &c.” “In this passage,” says Bishop Hopkins,⁵ “you clearly see how distinct were the Churches of the Eastern Empire from those of the West in the days of Basil. There is not here the least allusion to the authority of one common ruler at Rome, but a strong appeal to Athanasius at Alexandria to excite a movement among the Bishops of the West

¹ Basil is here referring to a speech of Diomedes to Agamemnon, in the 9th book of the Iliad, where, speaking of Achilles, he says:—

Μή ὅφελες λίστεσθαι ἀνίμων Πηλείωνα,
Μητρά ἐδὼ διέντος ὁ δ' ἀγήνωρ εἰς καὶ ἄλλως,
Νῦν αὐτὸν πολὺ μᾶλλον ἀγνοεῖσθαι ἐνῆκες.
—Homeric Iliad ix., 694.

“Thy supplications to the valiant son
Of Pelusa, and the offer of thy gifts
Innumerable, but I have better fit with.
He is at all times haughty, and thy suit
Hath but increased his haughtiness of heart
Past bounds.”

—Cowper’s Homer, 835.

² “Mīhi venit in mentem illud Diomedis usurpare μῆ όφελες λίστεσθαι εἰστε, φησιν, αγηνωρ εστιν ὁ ἄνηρ. Νομίνεται, dum obsequio cultorū, s’ dico atrocioribus fieri solent. Etenim si nobis placuerit nomi nus, quoniam alio admīnētū indicemus? Si autem perseret eret ra Dei, quidam nōbis præsidiū superciūtū Oce dentalis (ποια βοήθεια ἡμῖν τῆς δυτικῆς φύσους?); Qui veitatem neque normāt, neque dicere voluit (οὐ το ἀληθεῖσθαι τοσαν, οὐτε μαθεῖν ἀλέχοντα), sed falsi suspicibus praecupati eadem nunc faciunt, sc̄ prius in M̄rcili causa, in qua cum hominibus veritatem sibi lūmantibus delitavantur, hæresis vero per seipson confirmarunt. Eḡo ioseph extra communem formam ad eorum per phænum scribere volbam, de rebus quædam ecclesiasticis nihil, nisi quatenus subsecvētū insinuām, neque illos de rebus nostris vera nosse, neque viam quā adiisse posse, amplēt; ac ḡneratim admoūsem heminibus, quæ tentationes affligerunt, insultaūtam non esse, neque dignitatem astimandam sup̄bilem; quod recitatū v̄l unicūm id valet, ut inimicis Deo affiat.”—Epis. 239, Euseb. Epise. Samosatorm, p. 533, tom. iii. Bon Ed.

³ “Et alibi de Romana Ecclesia dicat. Odi fustum illius ecclesiae”—Baron. Annales. Ad. Ann. 372, sect. 32, tom. iv., p. 321. Antwerp, 1651.

⁴ “Fortasse rebus communibus non nihil accesserit utilitas, Imperatore multitudinis auctoritate et populis ubique ipsos sine dubio sequentibus.”—Idem Ep. 66, p. 227.

⁵ The Church of Rome in her primitive purity, compared with the Church of Rome at the present day. J. H. Hopkins, Bishop of Vermont, U.S. Rivington, London, 1839, p. 261.

in general, which might favourably influence the Eastern Empire and the people at large; but if, as you (Romans) suppose, the whole Church throughout the world was placed from the beginning, by *Divine authority*, under the government of Peter and the Roman Bishop, what had Basil to do with beseeching Athanasius to excite the compassion of the Western Bishops in his behalf? In such a case he would have had a *legal right* to the protection of Rome, and could not have anticipated the want of willingness on the part of the Western Bishops to take the same care of heresy in the East that they had done in the West, among themselves; so that we here have the plainest evidence that there was no such thing as Roman supremacy over the Catholic Church in the mind of Basil; that the dominion of one Church as the mother and mistress’ Church of the whole Christian world was perfectly unknown to him; and that the patriarchs of the East and West could not affect each other by any ecclesiastical rule of subordination, but only by that influence which sympathy produces amongst bodies mutually independent and free.”

In another Epistle to Athanasius (No. 69, p. 231-2, sec. 1), in which Basil again speaks of applying to the Bishop of Rome, it is remarkable that he addresses Athanasius as the “head of all” (*ώπερ εἰπι κορυφὴν τῶν ὄλων*), and the “counsellor and leader of every thing” (*καὶ οὐ συμβούλω τε χρησαμέθα καὶ ηγεμόνων τῶν πράξεων*), and explains that what he wants in the deputies he asks for, is *mildness and moderation of speech*; and especially that they should bring with them a copy of what was done in the West to annul the acts of the Arian Council of Ariminum. We give the whole passage in the note.⁶

We regret that our space precludes us from going more fully into these truly interesting and instructive letters; but we think we have given enough from them to show that the conclusion which another recent and able writer⁷ has drawn from these remarkable records is true; “that the ‘chair of Peter’ had no place in Basil’s mind; he neither expected nor desired any other assistance from Rome but what should arise from active sympathy, and the strenuous exertions of her vast influence to solve the doubts and mitigate the sufferings of the orthodox Churches in the East. But, instead of that sympathy and fellowship, he met with supercilious neglect, and, therefore, boldly pronounced her to have thereby disqualified herself as a mediator, and to have forfeited the confidence of his communion, which, under any other circumstances, would have joyfully and gratefully accepted her support.”

We doubt if among the many convincing proofs which the records of antiquity furnish of the falsehood of the Roman claims to universal dominion, there is any more completely satisfactory or conclusive than is to be found in the writings of this great Father, himself admitted to be a Saint by the Church of Rome itself.

We have merely to add to our brief historical sketch, that St. Basil died upon the 1st of January, A.D. 379,⁸ and that, notwithstanding his many efforts to restore peace to the Church, even the schism at Antioch was not concluded till nine months after his death.

WHY ARE WE PROTESTANTS?

In other words, Why are we not Roman Catholics?

We shall answer this question as briefly and plainly as we can.

1. In the first place, we cannot agree with the Church of Rome as to the *Rule of Faith*. She holds that this Rule consists of two *distinct and independent* parts, each of which is to be received with the *same pious affection and reverence*, viz., the *written word of God* contained in the Holy Scriptures, and the *unwritten word* preserved and handed down by the *Tradition of the Church*. We reject the latter, because we have no evidence of its divine original or authority. The Bible, whose divine original and authority are unquestioned, not only recognises no Rule of Faith beside itself, but condemns both expressly and implicitly any and every ultimate standard of Faith and

⁶ “Nobis autem opere pretium esse visum est, ad episcopum Romæ scribere, ut res nostras invias, et censum dare (*καὶ δούραι γράμμην*), ut cum illius communis ac Synodico dec̄to aliquos mitti difficile sit; ipsi hoc negotio snomre aggreditur, eligens hemines idoneos ad eos, qui apud nos perversi sunt, levigate ac animi constantia corrigitur; note et *adtempore* utræcunque synoma, seunque habentes quacumque iost Ariminum. *Conciliatio* dicitur ad corrum quæ per r̄milia acta tuerantur disolumentum; tique necum secrete circa stripem tunc mare huc avenerint, ut opinoribꝫ inimicorum pacis præterventur.”—Id. tom. iii., p. 232. We may just observe here, that both Dupin and Cave were led into error as to this passage, in supposing that what St. Basil required was that these deputies should bring with them the Canons of Ariminum, in order that they should be nullified.—See Eccl. Hist. vol. I., p. 230, Cave’s Primitive Fathers, Life of Athanasius, vol. ii., p. 189. Dupin and Cave both wrote before the Benedictines had published their edition of St. Basil. The old reading was *τὰ εἰς Αριμίνῳ*, whereas, the Benedictines show from six old codices that the correct reading is *τὰ μετὰ Αριμίνῳ*, referring to the proceedings of the Council held by Damasus in 369, declaring those of Ariminum in 359 to be of no force. This letter was written probably in 371, not two years after the Council in 359, and when the orthodox Bishops in the East were naturally anxious to have an authentic report of proceedings in the West against their common foes the Arians.

⁷ Mr. Greenwood on the Cathedra Petri, chap. x., p. 233. C. J. Stewart, London, 1851.

⁸ For an interesting account of the death and funeral of St. Basil, see Cave’s life, vol. ii., p. 255, where his epitaph by Gregory Nazianzen is also given.

⁹ “Par ieiatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur.”—Decr. Conc. Trid. Sess. iv.

Morals except itself. The existing records of early Christian antiquity prove convincingly that the Scriptures *alone* were regarded by the primitive Church as the source and the test of all true doctrine. The proof of these positions we have already given at length in the pages of the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*.¹⁰ We now simply state the result of our investigations, as our first reason for being Protestants.

2. We cannot agree with the Church of Rome as to *what constitutes the written word of God*. We reject certain books and portions of books as apocryphal and uncanonical, which she receives as of equal authority with the rest. We reject them because they formed no part of the Canon of the Jewish Church, which our blessed Lord and His Apostles sanctioned; and because they were never received as inspired documents by the Christian Church at large, and never by any considerable portion of it till the 16th century, when the Council of Trent canonized them in its 4th session. We cannot accept the Church of Rome’s definition as to what is divinely inspired Scripture.¹¹ This is a second reason why we are Protestants.

3. We cannot agree with the Church of Rome as to the *nature of the Church*. She holds that in its *essence* the true Church is an *external, visible society*, and that *internal virtues* are not requisite in order to constitute a member of the true Church.¹² She holds, moreover, that the Church has one *visible earthly head* and supreme governor, the Bishop of Rome, who, by *Divine right*, is invested with these functions, as the vicar of Christ upon earth. We maintain, on the other hand, that the *essence* of the true Church consists in what is *internal spiritual, and invisible*, except so far as the inner life manifests itself on the outer life and character of the believer. We maintain, further, that the Church has no visible, earthly head and supreme governor, and that Christ alone is its invisible Head and ruler. We deny that the Bishop of Rome has any claim whatsoever to be regarded as invested, *de jure divino*, with these functions. We cannot find a particle of evidence in Scripture to prove that he is, by divine appointment, the successor of St. Peter and the Vicar of Christ.¹³ Nor can we find in the records of Christian antiquity any evidence that he was acknowledged *de facto* as the one and supreme head of the Christian Church; on the contrary, we have abundant testimony in those records to show that the supremacy of the Pope was a doctrine absolutely unknown to the Church for many centuries, and not even asserted by the Bishops of Rome themselves.¹⁴ We further differ from the Church of Rome as to the existence in the Church of a tribunal which is divinely constituted as the *infallible judge* of controversy, and the *infallible expositor* of Scripture; much more do we protest against the doctrine of the Church or Bishop of Rome being invested with such functions. As the notion of the *Infallibility of the Church (of Rome)* is the mainstay of the Romish ecclesiastical system, so have we devoted to its discussion a proportionate amount of our time and our space. In looking over our Indices we find that in every one of our volumes the subject occupies a prominent place, and the result of our investigations on this head, as well as of the others connected with the nature of the Church, is, that the evidence against the Romish views on this subject is so overpowering that it furnishes another reason why we ought to be, as we are, Protestants, and not Roman Catholics.

4. We cannot agree with the Church of Rome as to the *state of man prior to the fall*. She teaches that the “*original righteousness*” (*originalis justitia*) which Adam possessed before he fell was not something connatural with man, not an intrinsic and inherent characteristic of his fallen humanity, but an adventitious ornament, an *extrinsic, accidental, and supernatural gift superadded by God*.¹⁵ We hold that the moral rectitude of man before the fall (his original righteousness) was not something extrinsic, accidental, supernatural, and superadded to his original constitution, but the natural result of his physical and mental constitution, whilst his various appetites and faculties were in exact proportion, and all subservient to the higher principles of reason and conscience. This difference is not a merely abstract or speculative one, but of the utmost practical moment; inasmuch as on it depends the widely diver-

⁶ Vide e. g. vol. i., pp. 61, 119, 136.

⁷ On the Apocrypha, *ha. vid.*, vol. ii., p. 111, 125; vol. iii., p. 1; vol. iv., pp. 68, 82.

⁸ “*τοιούτοις*,” says Bellarmine, *de Eccl. Milit.* c. 2, “is the distinction between our opinion and all others, that they require internal virtues (i.e. the operation of the Spirit in the heart) to constitute any person a member of the Church; but we deny that any *internal virtue* is requisite to entitle a man to be called a member of the true Church, but only an *external profession of faith*, and that participation of the sacraments which is perceptible by the senses.”

⁹ That the Papacy, as an institution, did not begin to develop itself till the fourth century is abundantly admitted by Dr. Newman, Mr. Whiffen, and other zealous Romanists. “First,” says Dr. Newman (Development, p. 165), “the power of the Bishop awoke, then the power of the Pope.” “Nor could a Pope arise but in proportion as the Church was consolidated.”—p. 145. “The Papacy began to form as soon as the empire released its tyrannous oppression of the Church.”—p. 167.

¹⁰ On the subject of the Church, vide vol. vi., pp. 14, 51, 130. On the Supremacy of the Pope, vide vol. v., vi., vii., passim.

¹¹ The Council of Trent is very brief and guarded on this head. The question was one on which the schoolmen were divided; and the Fathers of the Council were, therefore, unwilling to decide either way. They only say in general terms (Dover, *de pcc. orig. Sess. v.*) that “the first man immediately lost the holiness and righteousness (sanctitatem et justitiam), in which he had been constituted.” They do not say in what that holiness consisted. The Roman Catechism, however, expressly says (l. 2, 16) “*tunc* originalis justitiae admirabilis donum a *tdidit*.”

gout view which the Church of Rome and we Protestants respectively take of the state of man *subsequent* to the fall; which, again, is intimately connected with the whole scheme of justification and salvation as maintained by her and us severally. This fundamental error as to the state of man prior to the fall is, accordingly, another of the reasons which justify us in maintaining our protest against the Church of Rome.

5. We cannot agree with the Church of Rome as to the state of man subsequent to the fall. The Church of Rome holding, as we have just seen, that original righteousness was not connatural with man in his state of innocence, but a superinduced ornament, or superadded gift; as a consequence of that doctrine, she further teaches that the effect of the fall consisted in the loss or privation of that gift of original righteousness, and not in any pristine corruption or depravation of his nature. The exact nature of the sin connected with that loss, viz., original sin, she studiously avoids defining. But the schoolmen, and the best expositors of the opinions of the Fathers of the Council, agree in representing this sin to be of a very insignificant character, both in its nature and consequences.⁴ We, Protestants, hold, on the other hand, that "original sin is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally⁵ is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness (ut ab originali justitia quam longissime distet), and is of his own nature inclined to evil" (Art. ix. of the united Church of England and Ireland). This fundamental difference as to the nature of original sin is another reason why we are Protestants, convinced, as we are, on the grounds of reason and Scripture, that the Romish theory of original righteousness and original sin is a purely scholastic fiction.

6. We cannot agree with the Church of Rome as to the effects of Baptism. By the decree of Trent (Sess. v., sec. 5) it is declared, and an anathema is fulminated against all who deny it, that by the grace of Baptism not only is the guilt of original sin remitted, but "everything is absolutely taken away which has the true and proper nature of sin." The decree adds, that although the concupiscence which remains after Baptism is called sin by the Apostle Paul (Rom. vi. 12; vii. 8), still it is not really and properly sin, but was so called because it proceeds from sin, and inclines to it. We Protestants prefer to believe that when the Apostle says that the concupiscence which remains after Baptism is sinful, he means what he says, and, accordingly, our doctrine is, "that this infection of nature doth remain even in them that are regenerated (by baptism); and that "although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptised (or regenerated), yet concupiscence has of itself the nature of sin" (Art. ix.). As we build our doctrine in this particular on the express words of Holy Scripture, we have one more unanswerable reason for being Protestants.

7. We cannot agree with the Church of Rome as to the number of the Sacraments. The Council of Trent, in its seventh Session, anathematizes every one who will not admit that there are seven true and proper sacraments, neither more nor less; and that all these sacraments were instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ. We Protestants, on the other hand, maintain that our blessed Lord instituted but two sacraments, viz.: Baptism and the Supper of the Lord (Art. xxv.). We reject the so-called sacraments of Confirmation, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony. Our reasons for doing so are very plain and clear. We have stated them at length already in these pages. Our arguments against the existence of seven sacraments will be found in Vol. iii., p. 56, and vol. iv., p. 25. That Confirmation is no sacrament we have proved, vol. ii., p. 56. That Extreme Unction is no sacrament we have proved, vol. i., p. 85. That Orders are no sacrament we have proved, vol. ii., p. 57. That Matrimony is no sacrament we have proved, vol. iv., p. 25. And as to Penance, it has neither divine institution nor matter, which are admitted to be essential parts of a sacrament. Inasmuch, therefore, as the number seven is purely arbitrary, and inasmuch as the five Romish sacraments have no foundation in the Scriptures or in the usages of the early Church, we are furnished with additional reasons why we are Protestants.

8. We cannot agree with the Church of Rome on several important points connected with the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. She holds the doctrine of Transubstantiation; that is to say, that "by the consecration of the Bread and Wine there is effected a conversion of the whole substance of the Bread into the substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the Wine into the substance of His Blood" (Conc. Trid. Deecr. de Euchar., Ses. xiii., c. 4). We reject this dogma of Transubstantiation, because it "cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions" (Article xxviii.). We have devoted many pages to the discussion of this dogma (see, e.g., vol. v., p. 76 and p. 109); and we have adduced so many convincing arguments against it from reason, from Scripture, from the early Church writers, and from the

early Church practice, that, even if we had no other reason for being Protestants than the fact that this monstrous fiction of the middle ages constitutes an essential part of the creed of the Church of Rome, we should deem ourselves fully justified in withdrawing from her communion.

9. We cannot agree with the Church of Rome as to the dogma of the Sacrifice of the Mass. She holds that in the Mass there is offered a true propitiatory sacrifice for the living and for the dead; and that this sacrifice is one and the same with the sacrifice on the Cross; the only difference being that the one is bloody, the other unbloody. (Conc. Trid. Sess. xxii., Deecr. de Sacr. Misæ, c. 2). We maintain, on the contrary (Article xxxi.), that "the offering of Christ once made is a perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone." So plainly can we demonstrate this fundamental truth from Scripture, and so essential do we deem it, as it obviously is, to the perfection and dignity of the Atonement, that we do not hesitate to declare in strong terms that "the sacrifices of the Masses, in which the priest is commonly said to offer Christ for the living and the dead, are blasphemous fables and pernicious impostures." This is strong language; but if it be proved, as it has been proved, that this dogma of the Sacrifice of the Mass conflicts in many ways with the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross; conflicts with the sole and perpetual priesthood of Christ; and obscures or overturns the means which Christ Himself ordained for the application of the merits of His death; then the language is not stronger than the momentous importance of the subject demands. In the pages of the LAYMAN we have examined this whole matter (vid. e.g., vol. v., p. 129), and so clearly opposed has the dogma in question been proved to be to the plain and express teaching of Scripture (especially Hebrews, chaps. ix. x.), to reason, and to the teaching of the Christian Church in its early and purer ages, that upon this ground and for this reason, in addition to all the rest, we are and must be Protestants.

10. We cannot agree with the Church of Rome on the subject of Communion in one Kind. Our reasons for protesting against this dogma may be seen in vol. v., p. 49 and p. 63. We showed in those articles that it is utterly opposed to Scripture and to the practice of the Christian Church from the earliest ages down to the beginning of the fifteenth century. We adduced a number of patristic passages, all proving that the Fathers, without exception, believed the cup to be an indispensable part of the Eucharist. And, lastly, we quoted the words of Cardinal Bona, one of the most learned and esteemed ritualists of the Romish Church, who candidly admits that "it is certain that always and everywhere, from the first origins of the Church down to the fifth century, the faithful communicated under the species of bread and wine." Inasmuch, then, as the Church of Rome does in this particular violate the express command of Christ, and run counter to the undisputed practice of the first twelve centuries; and inasmuch, moreover, as the Tridentine dogma is based solely on the theory of concomitance, which was itself a fiction of the mediæval schoolmen, we point to the doctrine of communion in one kind as one of the most powerful of the reasons why we are Protestants.

11. We cannot agree with the Church of Rome on the subject of Purgatory. This subject has been most fully discussed in our pages, especially in the first four volumes. We have shown that the dogma has no foundation in Scripture, nor yet in Tradition; but rests solely on pretended revelations of a comparatively recent date. We have pointed out that it was originally invented by heathen philosophers, and was adopted into Christianity from paganism. We have proved that the early Fathers and Popes knew nothing of its existence; and that its late introduction into the Church is admitted by several eminent Romish writers themselves. Considering all this; and, moreover, taking into account that this dogma is the parent of Indulgences, and of many of the grossest superstitions which disgrace the unreformed Church, we are furnished with another and most powerful reason why we are Protestants.

12. We cannot agree with the Church of Rome on the subject of the Invocation of saints and angels. This doctrine also has been most fully investigated by us in vols. iii., v., vi. We have shown that there is not, in the entire compass of the sacred volume, so much as the remotest hint that dead saints intercede for us, nor any proper instance of persons seeking their intercession; neither is there any promise that prayers to them or through them will meet with a favourable acceptance. We have shown that the invocation of saints and angels is inconsistent with real devotion to God, and was, therefore, actually condemned by ancient Fathers and Councils. We know that the cautions and distinctions laid down by the Council of Trent are unknown or neglected in practice, and that, consequently, the worship and homage which are due to God and Christ and the Holy Ghost, and to them alone, are in fact paid to saints and angels, to the great dishonour of God and the infinite danger of human souls. We cannot believe that the Church which teaches such a doctrine can be right, and therefore we are Protestants.

13. Especially, we cannot agree with the Church of Rome as to the worship which she pays to the Virgin Mary. We honour and respect her as the mother of the blessed

Jesus, the incarnate God; but we do not, we dare not yield to her the same reverence and homage as we pay to Him and to the Father. We find not a tittle in Scripture to countenance the adoration which she receives from the Church of Rome (vide LAYMAN, vol. i., p. 99). The writings of the early Fathers we have seen to be either utterly silent about her, or at least to say nothing about paying her worship (vide vol. i., p. 116 and p. 135, vol. ii., p. 41). We have proved (vol. iii., p. 83) that the earliest precedent that can be produced for paying her adoration is the idolatrous worship offered to her by a sect of female heretics or fanatics, who lived in the 4th century. We have shown (vol. iii., p. 116) that her worship was adopted by Christians in the 5th century, with the view of attracting pagans to Christianity—in short, as a pious fraud. We have adduced various passages from the "Glories of Mary," the "Litany of the Blessed Virgin," and other recognised books of modern Romish devotion, in which divine attributes are ascribed to the Virgin, and in which she is treated on a footing of perfect equality with the persons of the blessed Trinity (vide e.g., vol. i., p. 40; vol. ii., p. 83). We have proved, moreover, that the story of her Assumption was unheard of in the Church for full seven hundred years after her death (vol. iii., p. 108). We have shown that the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, which, on the 8th December, 1854, was, for the first time, decreed by Papal authority to be an article of faith, was unknown for the first thousand years after the Church's history (vide vol. iii., p. 97, 130, 147); that it has no foundation in Scripture, but is contradicted by Scripture and by the Fathers; and that St. Bernard, especially, in the 12th century, declared, not only that the doctrine was novel, but founded on a false revelation. When we consider all these things, and when we see incontestable proof that Romanism is practically becoming every day a pure Mariolatry, and that the worship of God and of Christ is virtually absorbed in that of the Virgin Mary, we deem it our imperative duty, as it is our hereditary privilege, to be Protestants.

These are briefly some of the reasons why we are Protestants, and which we have stated and discussed fully in the pages of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN. Our limits forbid us at present to recapitulate other points of difference between us and the Church of Rome, which still further swell the number of our reasons for being Protestants; such, for instance, as Image-Worship, Adoration of Relics, Indulgences, Celibacy, Intention, &c. All these questions also we have fully and fairly stated and examined in our pages, and in each and every case we have arisen from the discussion with our convictions more strengthened that we ought to be, as we are, PROTESTANTS.

THE CANONS OF SARDICA AND APPEALS TO ROME.

The seventh canon of "the Council of Sardica" (as we now have them) is often produced in controversy, to establish the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome.

We propose now to examine the authority of this canon; and for this purpose we shall first state it in full, as it was first quoted.

"If a Bishop shall have been accused, and the assembled Bishops of his province shall have judged him, and shall have degraded him, and the Bishop shall appear to have appealed, and shall have fled to the most blessed Bishop of the Church of Rome, and shall have desired to be heard; and he (the Bishop of Rome) shall think it just that the examination should be renewed, let him think fit to write to those Bishops who are in the bordering and adjacent provinces that they should diligently investigate all things, and decide according to the fidelity of truth. But if he who asks that his cause should be heard again should move by his entreaty the Bishop of Rome to send a presbyter from his own side, it shall be in the power of the Bishop of Rome to do what he may wish and think right. And if he shall have decreed to send persons who, being present, may judge with the Bishop, having his authority by whom they are sent, let that be in his own power. But if he shall think that the Bishops of the province are sufficient to terminate the business, let him do what he may think fit in his most prudent counsel."

This canon was produced by Pope Zosimus, and Pope Boniface, and Pope Celestine, to the Church of Africa, in the years from 417 to 423, and was rejected by the Church of Africa and by St. Augustine as spurious.

That canon has been produced to us by Dr. Geraghty

⁴ Chemnitz (Exam. Deecr. Conc. Trid., p. 89. Edit. Franc. 1609) proves this conclusive from the statements of Andradinus, one of the leading theologians of the Council.

⁵ This word "naturally" was added in order to exclude our Lord Jesus Christ, and Him alone of all the descendants of Adam.

⁶ Si Episcopus accusatus fuerit, ac judicaverint congregati episcopi regios ipsius, et de gradu suo ducerint eum, et apud eum episcopus videatur, et confugerit a beatissimum ecclesie Romane episcopum, et voluerit andiri, et justam putaverit, ut renovetur examen; scribere his episcopis dignetur, qui in unitate et propria sua provincia sunt, ut ipsi diligenter omnia requirant, et juxta fidem veritatis definiant. Quod si quis rogat causam suam iterum andiri, deprecatione sua moverit eum episcopum Romanum, ut latere suo presbyterum mittat, eit in potestate Episcopi Romani, quid velit, et quid estimat. Et si decreverit mittendos esse; qui presentes cum episcopis judicent, habentes auctoritatem eius, a quo destinatis sunt, erit in suo arbitrio. Si vero crediderint sufficiere episcopos, ut negoio terminum imponant, faciat quo sapientissimo concilio suo judicaverit.—Labbe and Coss. II. 1590. We quote from Pope Zosimus's letter, read in the sixth Council of Carthage. The seventeenth Sardican canon was also quoted in the letter of Pope Zosimus; but as it does not relate to appeals to Rome, we need not give it.